

Questionnaire Comment Summary

Supplement to “Questionnaire Results”

South Willamette Revised Concept Plan: Building Form and Streetside Character

Key:

Green: Online Questionnaire (59 respondents, 10.30.12-12.11.12)

Purple: South Willamette Public Workshop Questionnaire (24 respondents, 10.30.12)

Blue: Table Comments and Public Workshop (50+ participants including 24 above, 10.30.12)

Questionnaire responses collected 10.30.12-12.11.12; 83 Total Respondents;
Please also see “Questionnaire Results” document for full results.

Question 4:

The October 2012 Revised Draft Concept Plan "Places for Business & Living" map, illustrates the following changes:

- Reduced height of Mixed Use to three stories along the street stepping back to five stories,
- Allowing Mixed Use further south along Willamette Street,
- Instead of allowing Row Houses in all Single Family Options (SFO) areas, limit this option only to a few specific areas,
- Requirement for Row House character at certain apartment and condo areas,
- Show a conceptual plan for the Willard School site in the event it is no longer a school.

Do you feel that these changes better meet the needs of the community?

Comment

- Don't know
- Above states 3 stories step back to 5, but map shows 5 step back to 3
- The emphasis on building design seems a little weird – you've put current fads on a pedestal. Isn't that what killed downtown?
- Single Family houses should remain between 24th Ave. and 25th Ave. and between Portland and McMillan - no apartments and condos here
- What do the numbers on the map mean? It doesn't seem to be number of stories, because it shows 4, 5, and 7 on Woodfield Station, and that would be very puzzling.
- It's an improvement, yes. But the lack of coordination with revamping the street itself makes this much less interesting.
- I would like to see at least 2 tall towers in the South Willamette area and a row housing option in all SFO areas, hold the line at 24th Avenue - to help create a Gateway that shows you are entering a "neighborhood" vs just an extension of more "Downtown"
- Limits density within the existing UGB & increases the cost of the dwelling units.
- Question the amount of row housing allowed @ Willard vs. other parts of study area; why not more mixed use in the Donald triangle?
- Height of development north of 24th should be limited, and property west of Portland between 24th and 28th should have the single family swapped with the apartment/condos. Several taller (7-8 story) narrow apartment/condo "Towers" should be allowed by some

special condition along the west edge of Amazon to take advantage of the view, but preserve the transparency of view from College Hill.

- Allow up to 5 stories of mixed-use on the street, with or without a step-back.
- Better than earlier draft but needs work.
- But careful with making sure (encourage) building design that fits the area.
- I do not know
- Need community gardens!
- Need maps of current zoning that shows maximum density allowed and maximum height allowed.
Also need block maps that show current density
- My biggest concern is that my home is right next to the proposed row homes along Willamette. I don't want that as my neighbor and I don't want to see my home value drop because of it.
- First meeting
- North end of Oak St. between 24th Place & 25th Ave. needs to be tied into the bike plan system.
- 3-stories next to single family? unknown redevelopment potential
- Looking toward future; how can the district be enhanced, improved as change occurs?
- Want to explore how to make the area more vibrant
- Row housing has potential to add density without killing neighborhood.
- Redevelopment will happen when it makes sense financially
- Mixed-use development on commercial is good
- PDX model – focuses redevelopment on corridor
- Design Elements/Enhanced Character can help minimize impacts on existing fabric
- 5-story scenario good
- Concern about possible “tunnel” effect of bldgs.
- Looking for sense of possible development over time vs. limits drawn on map
- Maintain views and the lower existing form of the neighborhood – 3 stories or under
- Different feel north of 24th – 5 stories is too high for this area
- Concern about transition from 3 story buildings to neighborhood along Portland
- Swap single family/row house on opposite sides of 24th west of Willamette
- Like removal of high-density from study area
- Like extending mixed-use south
- Like idea of something at Willard site
- Like that there is higher density (row houses?) near Amazon. Parkway good for transportation
- Oak Street is used for everything – concern about extra traffic and speeding on Oak
- Need complete sidewalk network
- Horizontal mixed-use is good
- Like having some density off Willamette – would support more density off Amazon – design details are important
- Need to look more closely at 27th and Willamette – both for traffic flow and design –don't like round-abouts because of continuous flow of vehicles
- Taller buildings along Amazon Parkway would make park more special
- Need to look at view corridors
- Form of buildings is important
- Why was High-Density housing (apts/condos) removed from the plan? Response: more even-handed than choosing particular sites and more realistic for potential development in the area.

- A few participants are still interested in seeing higher bldgs./density in certain areas – close to Amazon and LTD terminal
- Row houses are a good type if well designed (example olive& 19th)
- Individual concern: Buildings are being determined but what is the sense of neighborhood? What will the community be beyond bldgs.? This should be considered such as planning pocket parks. Response: the Connections and Open Space Concept Map is discussed
- Good ideas (nodding heads). Hard to imagine
- Huge improvement (lower heights)
- Recommend buffers on back property lines, especially where no alley separates
- Prefer alley access for garages
- Need garage standards for townhouses, limit garage doors facing street
- Prefer if articulated like they are at 24th Place (new Parvin Place) , okay like Pearl in Portland
- Is there any talk of open spaces?
- Remove density at Willard site (table-wide nods) ??
- Want to see more definition of what a cycle track is (can't be like river path). Truly buffered?
- Add to list: Eyes on the street don't do anything unless you know the people
- Need small parks. Pocket parks? Yes; example 15th Street on Fairmount
- Good idea, but need visibility or could be like near Tiny Tavern

Question 6:

Do the proposed building design and street-side character ELEMENTS for the MIXED USE areas reflect the long-term needs of the community?

Comment (e.g. limit blank walls)

- Yes, but how will this be codified? Will Code require high quality materials and what is that definition? What is a well-defined entrance that is of high quality design versus a well-defined entrance that isn't, because I'm assuming we want a high quality well-defined entrance. How would this amount of interest and articulation and detail be codified? Because, this is a lot.
- It's all about how the design elements are going to be controlled by the City. If the properties have a design review overlay, which includes ability to regulate such design issues, this might work. Just hoping it will happen will not achieve it.
- wide permanent awnings over business entries
- GREEN ROOFS!
- Though I would like buildings to max at 3 stories.
- Need more detail to evaluate fully. Too vague to assess abuse potential.
- Willamette needs as much space for traffic flow as possible. ie no parking on street , adequate access/parking behind buildings. Adequate sidewalks and bike lanes.
- Not sure why these design elements are being defined by the city rather than property owners
- Way too generic. This could be dropped in from any city anywhere in the world. Ugh. Am so glad I didn't major in architecture.
- bicycle (parking, bike racks, pathways) seem to be invisible in the drawings.
- I do not think there is nearly enough room on many streets; especially S. Willamette.
- Design standard may be difficult to developers to meet.

- With at least 2 towers in place this would work well enough...
- step back too high
- Buildings need to be further from sidewalks and street
- Concerned about "design standards" increasing the cost of projects.
- Need much more sidewalk room - set back buildings
- Encourage/require some canopy/awning coverage along the storefronts. Consider signage elements and their placement/proportion/orientation along the storefronts.
- Getting There
- Do not understand 3 story-step-back to 5 story then single home – seems daunting.
- It is hard to put into place concepts that are 10-20 years away from being utilized.
- I love the pedestrian-scale lighting & trees
- ? The community needs are ever changing
- Yes
- Need wider sidewalks on Willamette St.
- Yes
- Need wider sidewalks on Willamette St.

Question 7:

Do the proposed design ELEMENTS for MIXED USE STREET FRONTAGES reflect the long term needs of the community?

Comment

- Willamette Street project and this project need to show how they are working together to address sidewalk and bike path area. This design shown here apparently still places bikes on the sidewalk, so that still needs to be addressed. Tree wells are too small. City code does not provide enough authority to Urban Forester and PW to require adequate street tree and street landscaping area, upkeep, and protection during construction. A lot of the character here is derived from the sidewalk material - City does not want alternative materials in the sidewalk - need to address with PW. Awnings extend out over the public s/w: could provide code language that requires awnings in public ROW, like downtown has. Green on-street merchandising is always going to look better than what a non-florist is going to have on the street - don't rely on on-street merchandising to create a space. Hanging plants need to be maintained. Businesses (unless they are a florist) tend to not maintain this sort of thing.
- The examples here do not approximate the condition along Willamette St. I can't think of any buildings which are built to the property line along Willamette. I think this is fortunate, and that the City should institute a setback requirement, so that there is more room for a pedestrian friendly environment between the street and the commercial area. Much of the frontage is parking lots, actually, which do not make for a people friendly environment. For me, the transition from the current situation to a people friendly street will not every be achieved if all the commercial development along the corridor is allowed to build up to 9 feet from the existing curb.
- Use paving materials that stay smooth over time (for alter-abled)
- more vegetation- planter boxes, tree pits

- On street merchandising can be charming or just junky. I would suggest caution here. I think of the typical stuff in front of a Michaels craft store as a bad example, or heaven help us the mattress store mentality.
- NO street parking....if you need to buildings will need to move back. for parking lots. We already bike/walk to do shopping on Willamette and it is, frankly, dangerous
- too confined and busy
- Don't think on-street parking is feasible
- Again - let property owners determine design. Trees are nice.
- on street parking might conflict with desire to have bike lanes and bus pull outs
- Sidewalk cafe seating.
- My huge concern is parking as my business is physical therapy. People need to have front-door close access to the business.
- I don't think a brick sidewalk would be a good surface for a wheelchair; it would also be expensive to install.
- See comment above.
- Outdoor seating for shops - where is that?? Public benches?? Protected bus stations??
- need bike areas
- Buildings need to be further from street; a planting strip for greenery/plants/stormwater detention
- Eliminate on-street merchandising - such activities impede pedestrian traffic
- Some more buffer elements at the parking curbside/street tree zone. The lone bike rack isn't well integrated, and the storefronts don't offer active (cafe?) setbacks
- Consider children & dogs @ play.
- Need to work on areas with narrow rights of way
- I like a lot of the elements, big windows, setback, mixed materials
- Windows & defined doorways are the most important. It would be nice to incentivize plazas, especially at street intersections. Where parking lot driveways intersect the ped sidewalk there should be low speed bump or textured paving so the motorist realizes they're crossing into the pedestrian realm. So many times drivers cross right into the sidewalk & brake at the curb to look for traffic & don't notice or look for pedestrians.
- Make 29th walkable!!!
- Trees – change character of street, reduce speed of vehicles, planter strip would help...
- Lights
- Banners
- Better storm water management
- Buffer
- Interesting shops
- Variety, not big box, blank walls
- Aesthetically pleasing
- Desire “undergrounding” utilities
- Current street-side environment challenging for people using wheelchairs
- Where are the opportunities in the R.O.W. width for changes? (street or sidewalk)
- Public art as an element of redevelopment of area. To the extent possible. Set aside space now.
- What are the needs that trees have to survive in planter?
- Wider sidewalks
- If sidewalks are not widened then need variable bldg. setback
- Need more space for business/bldg. accessories (umbrellas, seating)
- Reserve space for future sidewalk widening.
- Bottom floor could be set-back to provide more sidewalk space.

- Adequate pedestrian realm is an incentive for businesses, may attract pedestrian oriented businesses.
- Cycle-track creates more livable space than parking
- Pedestrian alleyways separated from street
- Separate pedestrians & bikes from cars.
- Wider sidewalks, cycle –tracks
- Designated bicycling zone, separate from pedestrian zone
- Perfect scenario is that everyone has their space
- Need space for bicycling.
- Create safe environment for bicycling
- Is parking on side streets enough?
- Disabled parking needs to be accommodated somewhere, maybe not on Main Street, (need wider space)
- 3 feet not wide enough for planet strip
- Would a landscape buffer be required between parking and pedestrian realm?
- People like proposed changes to design elements
- Concerned about aesthetic changes brought by taller buildings
- Need to look at solar access
- Need to think about signage – appropriately scaled – makes people slow down
- Driving experience is enhanced by character/scale of buildings along street
- Bike lanes are a buffer too – e.g. in front of Steelhead, Lucky Noodle, etc.
- Reducing number of curb-cuts & width will improve pedestrian experience
- Food carts & other temporary uses would enhance the walking experience
- Street trees are important – but space to allow sun.
- Can't see on street parking on Willamette – bottle neck
- Don't abandon section of Willamette south of 27th
- Like 28th cut-thorough/connection to SouthTowne shops
- Would love to see bigger set-back along Willamette – 5' minimum
- On-street parking you need more sidewalk
- But variability is good – allow arcades/overhangs
- Require a small set-back about 5' – comparison to library (good), LCC building (bad)
- Can you have parking bays on Willamette?
- Discussion of pros & cons of having buses stopping in travel lanes
- Need more buffer when there is no on-street parking – 5' buffer and 8' of walking space
- More pedestrians (?????) through longer blocks –semi-public, quieter (?????)
- Concern about trees in interim condition – they are dependent on Willamette Street conditions (street study)
- Interim is a big improvement because of the buffer
- Property owner/participant mentioned his trees were removed when bike lanes were added
- Interim is an improvement – buffer is safer for peds
- Curb-cuts need to be reduced for interim condition to work well
- Could the city facilitate getting cooperation between businesses to consolidate curb-cuts? Good idea.
- On- street parking safer for peds but potentially not safe for bikes. But can't imagine parallel parking on Willamette.
- Wider the sidewalk the better
- Discussion of a variety of complex trade-offs. Parking may mean bikes not on Willamette, etc.
- General consensus that a bike way just off but parallel with Willamette but quieter and slower traffic could be more desirable.

- Desire to see more precedents and example of successful projects in areas other than Eugene. Interest in seeing how narrow r.o.w. have accommodated multi-modal access.
- Benefit to property owners and community to accommodate a bus turn-out somewhere on Willamette
- Consensus on design elements and street-side character – GOOD!
- Moving bldgs. right to the edge of the property line/r.o.w. doesn't always work (w. 11th example) that is why we are having this in-depth design discussion
- Mixed view of whether on-street parking adds to buffer
- Visual blight differ; does make difference
- Add: substantial buffering with constructed planter features, swales, natural space
- Allow property owner flexibility to create more public space by setting building back-What's down side of setback? Break in street "wall" if too chopped up; cuts up shopping experience
- Decrease noise through design, street plan
- Recommend paving definition, to signal drivers at ingress/egress of pedestrian realm
- Need at least 10' more sidewalk width to make Willamette pedestrian friendly
- Space for bicycling parking fixtures: bike parking in front of buildings, corrals like Portland – no good Eugene example
- Design elements: Do people like these? Yes.
- Windows on WestTown on 8th are good, low sills
- Oregon Credit Union on 29th example of the worst that can happen.
- In principle, everyone likes these elements and principles.
- The designs are good but very expensive as recommended. Response: The plan will include a layered system of implementation tools, varying from regulations to guidelines to incentives
- Design elements are supported because FAN (Friendly Neighborhood) hoped/hopes for a refinement plan to really encourage good design. Standardize/require good design
- Positive about design ideas in general but how do you accommodate the latest sustainable design (down the road). Response: Need for flexibility in design guidelines.
- Vision: Instead of prescriptive design, guidelines should allow for style to evolve
- Don't want to preclude development because design guides are too restrictive.

Question 8:

Do the proposed design ELEMENTS for APARTMENTS and CONDOS reflect the long term needs of the community?

Comment

- Again, what are the actual proposed design elements and how would they be written into code? How is an "inviting porch" written into code? The landscaping shown here really isn't "high-quality" so what is the definition of that?
- Will on street patios be used? Depends on traffic volume & setbacks
- Reverse #12 and #9. MENTION SOLAR!!!
- Densities and heights are still too high on 24th Ave and north of 24th Ave. The plan still does not recognize the importance of preserving (and protecting) the lower-density residential College Hill area. The character of Willamette St. is very different in this area and a much greater effort to provide a gentle transition and buffering is essential to protecting the fragile edge of this neighborhood.
- semi-private spaces seem minimally useful
- too overpowering

- Once again - too much emphasis on design. 3 story limit seems good.
- The architectural design would make construction more expensive.
- Is everything ADA??
- must provide parking for cars other than on street
- Buildings need to be further from sidewalks and streets
- Once again adding additional cost to projects - need incentives
- Important that even perpendicular orientation of entries to the street/sidewalk can be inviting and make them a part of the public ROW visually
- **Need underground parking**
I would strongly encourage design for more landscaping options for residents above ground floor – vegetated facades being (???)

Question 9:

Do the proposed Single Family Options building design ELEMENTS reflect the long term needs of the community?

Comment

- It looks like this is a row house. While it may have articulation, its architectural design quality is pretty low; its simplification of a style that originally would have had a considerable amount more detail and mass (in the sense of permanence and character) is unsettling, leaving the structure to appear cheap, or like a vacation home. It is the landscaping and the brick walkway that save it.
- Some units without elevated first floor for alter-abled, elderly
- SOLAR POWER / WATER, GREEN ROOFS!
- Could be more of an urban character
- more color please
- Let property owners design their own buildings!
- it looks like all yards will disappear as SFO bloat, we have a strong garden community here. Also we lose solar gain on 24th place from all the shadows of the 5 story complexes.
- Same comment as #8, expensive design. The City needs to be mindful of the economy and not drive businesses away.
- Nice idea, but residents will do what they want, so "inviting porches", "accentuated windows" and landscaping pieces are irrelevant.
- Who will pay for improvements to the alleys which will be needed to access garages.
- The interesting and compatible roof line is worry some... What does it have to be compatible with - It self, the neighboring home or every other home on the block?? Where is guest parking??
- Buildings need to be set back further from sidewalks and streets; more space for front yards is needed.
- Design standards will increase cost
- High quality landscaping that does not impede pedestrian traffic is a must
- Add comment/criteria that garages/driveways don't dominate frontages, but allow access to the back of the lot
- **Concern about parking**

- It is nice for some step downs, open spaces for the mixed housing to mingle
- I like my neighborhood & find it so pleasant to walk thru because most driveways are single-wide (12') not double wide driveways (20')

Question 10:

Are the proposed concepts for transitions appropriate to help improve compatibility?

Other (please specify)

- A transition is not a line. This point appears to be recognized in the street design, where rows of parked cars and landscaping beds are spoken of as buffers (AKA transitions), but a line is still used when separating uses. Whole properties are transitions, not property lines. The example used here was cited as a worst case scenario. This is not a worst case scenario. The house used here has a driveway all along the property line in question. Most houses are not going to have this built-in buffer - they are going to be 5 feet from the property line. This fact changes your worst case scenario quite a bit. Also, where are the cars for the apartments? If the apartments are on a main road, the cars are going to be in the back. So, if there is 5 feet (or less) between the house and the property line, the home-owner really can't plant any buffering hedge there. What will be required on the commercial side? Would the commercial developer be the one planting the trees on the house's property, as shown in the last drawing? perhaps there need to be different buffer/transition requirements, depending upon how close the next door house is to the property line. Do not require SFD-looking apartment complexes - these more often end up looking cheap, since the size and use of the structure does not relate to the architectural style. The option with the more commercial design architecture is more dynamic and provides a better piece of architecture next to the house.
- I don't think putting a monster multifamily structure adjacent to a single family house will every be appropriate if it is allowed to be built close to the property line. The outcome will be deterioration of the single family housing. A better arrangement, in my opinion, would be to have parking, well screened by fencing and vegetation along the single family property, with the structure located on the multifamily zoned parcel on the far side of the parcel from the single family.
- Noise barriers in addition to trees
- solar, green roofs
- The plan still does not recognize the importance of preserving (and protecting) the lower-density residential College Hill area. The character of Willamette St. is very different at 24th (and north) and maintaining lower heights/densities and more graceful transitions is essential to protecting the fragile edge of this neighborhood. Be sure to protect the view shed of (e) College Hill residences. Thoughtfully consider rear yard/alley transition areas to ensure that higher density development does not encroach on adjacent single-family housing. Add transportation "transition" features (e.g. traffic calming) and note where needed as part of concept plan (e.g. on 24th Ave, just west of Willamette St).
- Always a difficult situation.

- final result still seems too massive because the single gable still looks like one big thing - even with crinkled edges; the single main roof line might be part of the problem
- the last picture looks more compatible for a single family
- Please consider effect of limiting direct sunlight to existing houses and yards
- I'd still hate to be the homeowner living next to or behind this apartment complex. 2 story apartments are adequate enough
- t current code height What about existing situations? I live in a nice 1950's house which is next door to the monolith of circa 1963 Cascade Manor on W. 30th. A few years ago the City allowed Cascade manor to lease their rooftop for a cell tower, and then increase the height of their already against current code tower around their existing mechanicals to make the building even higher. All this done without any notification to neighbors. When later confronted the city employee who rubberstamped this admitted that he made a mistake. The height of the building was the roof of the building, not the top of the mechanicals holding box on top of the roof.
- Looks good, but will cost more than simpler designs.
- need bike corridor. step back too high
- The dense tree screening shown is overdone and likely not realistic. A little less is more reasonable
- Transition options need to be designed to retain the single family character of the neighborhood. (No tall buildings facing cottages).
- Concerned about proximity of large high density & single family units
- Transitions by street, not by half block
- Consider two-story row houses where adjacent to single family detached (west side of Portland Street).
- They do help, but ultimately I would be very disappointed to see a row home or apartment on my street, particularly because I would be next door.
- Concern with a suggestion at our table that large buildings have sufficient setback around them to allow/encourage people to occupy that space.
- Townhouses: no garage in front & limit driveways to 1 and if you want (???) car garages – it must be off the alley. Greater rear yard set-backs where the townhouses abut share property lines with LDR zoned lots – the larger rear yard set-back wouldn't apply where alley or HDR or commercial abut. 41/2' ht. for windows above 1st floor that might be overlooking LDR lots. Although glass block and frosted windows on upper floors can preserve the backyard privacy of abutting LDR lots. 5' column trees along alleys need a set-back to allow landscaping.
- Urban village concept: more infill, but lower heights – include buffer (public space) between s.f. and taller – make transition at street only; not mid-block
- What's the size of transition area? Dependent on height?
- Landscaping "screens" between development types. (Residential sf next to hi-density residential). Privacy, value
- Location/proximity of balconies?
- What type of housing? Apts, condos, town houses, row houses
- Transitions are a good way to reduce anxiety among adjacent property owners/residents
- Use incentives for development? Yes, MUPTE for example. Pre-approved housing/bldg. design as incentive.

- Stepping Multi-family bldgs. In and out (step two in diagrams) brings the most dramatic change... (appreciation for articulation) not a monolith – no public space unfortunately
- Adjacent outdoor spaces, make more neighborly.
- Individual entries in back ... more neighborhood feel
- Architecture puts people with people ... need neighborliness; not just a place where people live
- Need community gardens, pocket parks
- Getting closer; still need better transitions b/t s.f. & higher heights and massing.

Question 11:

Does the proposed street-side character for Willamette Street meet the long term needs of the district as a whole and the needs of businesses? What changes do you suggest?

- Needs to be shown to be working more with Chris' street project. Where's the bike path?
- I think it is ironic that examples of how it might look as an interim solution include streets such as 6th or 7th. I would never choose to walk on those streets because it is unpleasant—a lot of traffic noise, pollution, and building walls. A thin sliver of ground core and a tree or two don't help much. More space is needed, and that is why a greater setback for buildings is needed. Bike lanes would also help to make the sidewalk experience a bit better. Definitely, the utility poles need to go. Maybe grade-separated bike lanes? The treatment shown in this picture is definitely lame.
- I think underground power lines are essential to developing the open feel of the sidewalk. Also the variable set back should tend more towards the 10 to 12 foot range (like the 'distant future' diagram), rather than the 'distant future' photo of 6th which is more confining than my ideal vision for Willamette.
- Require sidewalks at least 7' wide when properties redeveloped.
- Sidewalks still seem too narrow at 5 feet
- This would make some very positive changes!
- 5' is too narrow (can't pass). If limited space, at least provide bulb out areas (wide-narrow-wide). Also, if reduce/limit auto driveways, this will provide more ped sidewalk space and fewer conflict points. Consider bike parking in "planter strip" to help serve as buffer
- Please consider a combined sidewalk and bike travel path so that there is a wide walk, with street trees.
- 1. more than 9' buffer needed! 2. cycle track is a must!! 3. on street parking
- Sidewalk is too narrow
- last picture looks best and no parking meters
- Looks great! Huge improvement!
- The "character" of that street will be improved when the traffic volume is reduced by diverting through traffic to Amazon Pkwy or other routes.
- less scrubs more sidewalk
- Safer and pedestrian "friendly" is important...I commute by bike but feel that the needs of the existing businesses are more important (parking) than a MUST bike lane on Willamette. Bike lanes can be put on another street with access to Willamette via the side streets. I currently ride

down Pearl or Oak and it works. I have spoken with bikers who feel entitled to a lane on Willamette and do not agree. I fear a situation such as what happened on Broadway where existing businesses went out of business due to closing off the street to vehicular traffic. Please do not take away my parking (PT Solutions 2675 Willamette St.)

- For this to work, street traffic needs to be less; otherwise it will be a congested nightmare. And for that to happen, Amazon Parkway will have to be developed into a real 4 lane parkway; it already has an exit for the 27th & Willamette area, but traffic taking this exit will have to be going to S. Willamette for shopping, not to travel south. South traveling traffic would take the Parkway to Hilyard, and then W. 31st to Willamette. These arterials need to be developed along with the changes to South Willamette Street.
- It's all good, but is there room without taking travel lanes??
- The preponderance of front-facing parking lots destroys the street character. The plan needs to address that better. Also the plan doesn't account for the ugly utility lines, which may conflict with tree plantings.
- This is a back door approach to reduced travel lanes on Willamette Street.
- Close enough if the bikes are in the street, I liked the interim planting because of the plants and the bars that could slow down a bike or car if it entered the sidewalk.
- telephone/electric poles need to be buried to make more room for sidewalk/ped and bike lanes are absolutely necessary
- Needs a dedicated bicycle path in the street.
- The 6th Ave context with zero setback image isn't dominant on Willamette, and we want a little variation in setback, so show it that way for the "Distant Future" with an example that is like the section diagram instead
- Buffer zones – NO bike paths
- Buffer, ped. scale lights, trees, & wider sidewalk are good. We need fewer curb cuts into Woodfield Station.
- No on street parking.
- Need more information
- Co-existence with bikes as recreation & concept of walkable community
- Minimum of 15' needed for sidewalk and planting strip
- Need 15' between curb & bldg.
- No on-street parking – Three lanes will not work
- Be careful to allow adequate width for trees – may need wider sidewalk, r.o.w.
- This conversation needs to include transportation and it's hard to do without. Whatever you do, you have to make people slow down, provide more Willamette pedestrian crossings, bike lanes or you won't be successful.
- Need wider sidewalk on Willamette St., Also, eliminate driveways allowing access to businesses via side streets (consolidate curb cuts).
- Address the street (not this workshop, I know)
- On street bike parking, bike parking on the sidewalk were not mentioned at all in any of the plans, I think it is much needed thing to consider when developing the street idea. Don't just leave it on the developer to figure out the parking. And don't let the rack block the sidewalk.

- Use 4' wide planter boxes (concrete or brick not wood) 2 ½' high would provide a good buffer between travel lane & the pedestrian side walk. The planter boxes can provide a place for people to sit down too, i.e. 1' wide wall width along the sidewalk side of the planter box. This would not be needed if there was on-street parking along the curb.

Question 12:

What other options should we consider for Willamette street-side character, with the understanding that some of these may need more space? Other options to consider:

- What is a cycle track? Need to be offering up lots of holistic design options for the street. I checked all boxes, since need to explore the different lane designs. Planter strips need to be wide enough to sustain the trees. Even a 4-foot wide planter is pretty skinny. May want to additionally require reinforced sidewalks over larger planter wells (rather than grates) to provide more uncompacted soil for the street trees. Will also need to correct inefficiencies in street tree and street landscaping code language.
- Shared parking, reductions in curb cuts onto Willamette St. grade-separated bike lanes
- The cycle track is essential if no dedicated bike lane is created.
- Relying on on-street parking as traffic buffer takes space away from other amenities - get parking off streets wherever possible. No on-street parking is more comfortable for cyclists also. Explore traffic calming (in street study) to reduce speeds and need for reliance on on-street parking as buffer.
- BIKE LANE!
- I'd like to see planters/borders on the sidewalk/parking lot side, too. Let's make it very pedestrian friendly!
- Add bike lanes - needed for bike access and provided buffer for pads.
- Please don't create another 6th street here. We can do better!!!!
- Don't see that there is any room for these options
- Need to either accommodate bicycles or keep them out of the area.
- bike lanes would be good with only one lane of traffic going in each direction and a center turn lane.
- bike lanes
- Bike lanes so bikes are not on sidewalk. Undergrounded utilities. Fewer driveways.
- Definitely need some sort of bike path on Willamette. On-street parking will help make it a safer pedestrian destination. I visit several area businesses (e.g., make copies at UPS Store, or the bank, and then want to go to Eugene Hardware). I cross in the middle of Willamette St. It's a nightmare.
- I think bicyclist should consider taking parallel residential streets, then cut over when they reach their Willamette Street destination. This would also make sidewalks safer, without re-stripping and taking traffic lanes.
- Keeping it as is to meet capacity needs; also considering accommodating transit.
- None of the above.
- Street merchandising should not be allowed. Eliminate on street parking.

- definitely need a bike lanes or a place for bikes, also wider sidewalks and are more protected from the street, right now it can be super scary to walk on those sidewalks so close to traffic
- Allow planter strips to be 4' to 5' with occasional shallower "Notches" cut out for benches, bikes, cafe tables, etc.
- Redirect high/fast traffic - consider Willamette shopping & living only.
- Simple beautification
- No! on-street parking, swales and hard structures mixed, cycle track ugh!
- (Wider plant strip) as mini-park blocks
- No! on-street parking, 15' setback\
- No on-street parking, No!! cycle track
- Never cycle track
- Bicycle parking
- On-street bike parking, 15 ft. (10 for peds., 5 for planters and bike parking), bike lanes are better than cycle tracks for pedestrians
- On-street bike parking like in front of Kiva at 11th & Olive. I think the sidewalk is wide enough but needs to be set-back from the traffic lane. Planter boxes (brick).

Question 13:

Does the proposed street-side character for MIXED USE SIDE STREETS meet the long term needs of the area? Other (please specify)

- Is there really 15 feet of ROW in these areas? Are properties going to be dedicating ROW when they rebuild? If they were required to do so, wouldn't they just do an add/alt, so that they didn't have an entirely new building? Or, will some of the sidewalk shown above be actually on private property? Will a sidewalk easement be required? Again, if the building were built as an add-alt instead of an entirely new building, would this be required?
- BIKE LANES
- I don't like the street parking bulb out. Rather see planter strip. Parking is too scarce only about two cars per shop and it's right next to bike path. What about building shops on top of parking structures?
- This is fine, IF there is room WITHOUT taking traffic lanes.
- Adding a cycle track would make it ideal.
- Bike sharrow needed on Oak for cyclists going to amazon parkway
- Variable setback should be 5' to 10'
- Angle parking on side streets
- I like most of the ideas

Question 14:

Does the proposed street-side character of the shopping alley meet the long term needs of the area?

- Bikes and peds in ROW will need some demarcation or separation to avoid conflicts. Alley is great idea!

- Not sure how this would work - wasn't discussed. Is this just a block long? What happens to Willamette edge? Where does parking go? How much commercial can the area support? Alley better for residential access in mixed use area? Or "tucked in" parking area?
- This looks nice, but where would it be? I don't see it fitting into Willamette corridor.
- Didn't we used to have a whole bunch of this very thing downtown? Didn't it get ripped out in disgust?
- My experience has been that great care needs to be taken if you close off a street to vehicular traffic if considering the health of certain businesses.
- I like the weekly farmer's market at Southtowne on Saturdays. I don't have to go all the way downtown to Farmer's Mkt on W. 8th
- No, not at all. I hope the City has learned from the Broadway St. disaster.
- This seems absurd that we could make a viable retail environment on a hidden alley; also consideration needs to be made for adequate light, etc.
- Is this a first step in closing alley in the area?
- bike parking area needed
- Define what type of elements demark the ROW, like tree wells, surface planters, paving, etc.
- Love it!
- Let's think of what a vibrant area looks like in 20 yrs.
- Needs to be a green space & a gathering place.
- Like this idea.
- I like the idea of car free shopping areas
- Would the shopping alley allow cars? (closed open to cars on occasions)
- Shopping alley could be narrower
- Everyone likes shopping alley

Question 15:

Does the proposed street-side character for APARTMENTS & CONDOS meet the long term needs of the community?

- Require adequate off street parking associated with apartment building or condo development, so residents don't saturate all on street parking spaces.
- BIKE LANES
- Add transportation "transition" features (e.g. traffic calming) and note where needed as part of concept plan to ensure that traffic does not seep into adjacent low-density residential areas (this is already happening).
- Cascade Manor has bought up A LOT of property in the neighborhood of Portland Street and W. 29th Place. I would want to make sure their new developments would not be an eyesore. Their long term plan is to build a separate long-term care facility.
- Is there room for all of this??
- bike lanes/parking needed
- set-back needs to be greater, planter strip needs to be wider, delete parking lane.
- Wider sidewalks needed. City wide ban on overnight parking is needed.
- Concerns about transportation issues

Question 16:

Does the proposed street-side character for Single Family Options meet the long term needs of the area?

- How can we do the density right? To preserve character and increase vitality
- Space efficient housing
- A 3-foot planter strip isn't enough to maintain a healthy tree.
- I think this plan should recognize the quality of the housing which exists and make sure that the plan does not force its deterioration or redevelopment. Many houses are being improved by current owners, and the area of single family housing can continue as a wonderful pocket of relatively inexpensive houses on nice quiet streets close to all the wonderful services in the area.
- BIKE LANES
- Add transportation "transition" features (e.g. traffic calming) and note where needed as part of concept plan to ensure that traffic does not seep into adjacent low-density residential areas (this is already happening).
- If you don't have driveways that are deep enough to contain a car, then some will end up parking over the walk.
- bike lanes
- Same as #15, is there room? If it involves taking traffic lanes, the City needs to mention this. Otherwise the public will NOT be happy.
- 5' sidewalk width is too narrow, especially without bike lane/cycle track.
- Front setbacks are too deep and will limit density.
- travel lanes need bike lane
- As usual, set-back and planting strip need to be wider
- Wider sidewalks

Question 17:

Do the parking options shown meet the long term needs of the district?

- General comments: I would have liked to see some questions about what measures you might support to achieve goals of community health, active transportation, greenhouse gas emissions, to name a few. Is the City willing to impose development restrictions on the properties in this area to assure a desirable outcome? Site Review? How about a special district designation, such as was used for 5th St.? Otherwise, development will occur such as the large apartment building on 25th Place, which just went in, which has no outdoor amenities, so far as I can see, and all possible space used for parking, and very little of it at that. I think parking and ingress and egress to parking is a big issue. Is the City willing to take on the excessive number of curb cuts on Willamette St.? Eugene Hardware, for example, has parking to the rear. The shopping area with the Glenwood, Metropol, etc., could access and egress from side streets without any curb cuts on Willamette? Can you have a people friendly street with so many cars driving across the sidewalks and hanging out across sidewalks waiting to make left turns onto Willamette? What is your position on what the modal split will be in 20 years, and how is that reflected in this plan? n
- This is an improvement on the current condition. I'd like to see an emphasis on parking options 1,2,3,7 and 8. 9 should be used sparingly near higher density areas. Try to avoid 4 & 6.
- unclear diagram. What do the numbers mean?
- More podium inside, under. Reduce exposed ground level lots. PERMIABLE PAVING.
- If we clog Willamette with too much parking, north-south traffic will just move to other neighborhood streets that are already overloaded with traffic..

- Head in parking along the main street seems like it is asking for slower traffic and more accidents. Okay for side streets.
- On-street parking on Willamette St in commercial area inappropriate, but keep in residential area north of 24th Ave. Add transportation "transition" features (e.g. traffic calming) and note where needed as part of concept plan to ensure that traffic does not seep into adjacent low density residential areas (this is already happening). Before establishing desired parking areas, work out and plan for desired auto routes! Plan for those traveling to the area and through the area. The way autos, peds, and bikes travel in this area will have a huge impact on the character and success of the area. What are current and expected traffic counts with increased densities and commercial? Are you planning to change street classifications? Also, focus on key Willamette intersections (e.g. 29th and 27th).
- I don't see too many cases where there is sufficient room for much on street parking on main streets, especially not angle parking.
- Parking not feasible on main street. making an easy to use alternate through way (connecting Willamette to amazon parkway?) could make Willamette a more usable area for those walking and biking to shop
- Please get rid of on-street (i.e. strip mall) parking lots asap!
- Not keen on the angled parking on the main street - that doesn't work well.
- You just displayed 10 things. You need to narrow it down before you ask us. I like the tuck-under options best myself.
- Are you suggesting parallel and or angle parking ON Willamette Street itself? Ridiculous idea.
- Again, I'm all for centralizing parking except I need a few spaces in front of my business.
- Will the secluded parking areas be safe at night? I think there needs to be more of a mix. Have you been down Broad street, just seems like something out of the Soviet Union, dull gray, and boxed in.
- Shared parking agreements are difficult to manage. No on-street angle parking. Structure parking is too expensive.
- no main street parking. too dangerous for bikes/peds
- remove parking on Main Street, provide bike lanes and stormwater detention/planting strips
- As far as possible eliminate on street parking.
- Prohibit diagonal back-in parking (stinking exhaust on pedestrians). At corner parking structure, require some street-level frontage to be populated/occupied on one side
- No Willamette St. parking
- Need more info.
- I think a cycle track/bike lane would be better suited to the street than on-street parking if you had to choose.
- Traffic patterns that will accompany increased density are unclear.
- Preference for parking in/under buildings.
- You can't have street parking and a bike lane. Bike lanes need to address the thru biker, not just a shopping biker. The right solution is 2 travel lanes, one center lane & bike lanes.
- No parking on Willamette St., parking would continue to be in private lots or side streets.
- Bike parking needs to be considered just as much as cars do.
- Speed bumps/textured paving between sidewalk and private property driveway.
- Community/shared
- Lots; leave car and walk to multiple businesses
- Develop Amazon into more of a thoroughfare (thoroughfare definition?)
- Curb cuts – needed for business, create danger for peds; try to match number & size to business need – no extras.
- Consolidate curb cuts through business cooperative agreements for shared parking

- No left hand turns on Willamette during commuter hours
- Diagonal parking on side streets to support Willamette & market district and to slow down traffic
- Desire for parking – exempt areas from Willamette St. to adjacent alleys on each side. (24th – 30th)
- Are there bicycle parking requirements? Yes!
- Consolidate curb-cuts/driveway.
- Structured parking with retail on ground floor.
- But some sections have parking Don't do backing-in angle parking
- Parking behind Willamette is okay but make it clear that people should not cut through neighborhood
- People like proposed changes to design elements